

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 14, and 20 are the independent claims.

Claims 1-13, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to clarify the display of content, wherein the claims recite, *inter alia*, "executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device" and "determining a fee according to at least one device parameter upon executing the triggered rule for the display of content, wherein the content provider is charged the fee." Accordingly, Claims 1 and 20 are believed to satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 20, and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 101, as being directed to non-patentable subject matter.

Claims 1 and 20 claim, *inter alia*, "executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device" and "determining a fee according to at least one device parameter upon executing the triggered rule for the display of content, wherein the content provider is charged the fee."

The claimed limitations include the display of content and charging a fee. These limitations, individually, or in combination are believed to be useful, concrete, and tangible results, satisfying 35 USC 101. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 13-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohen (USPN 6,060,993). The Examiner stated essentially that Cohen teaches all the limitations of Claims 1-9 and 13-21.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that at least one spectator be detected.” Claim 14 claims, *inter alia*, “displaying content corresponding to each satisfied rule, wherein a first satisfied rule specifies that a spectator be detected and a second satisfied rule specifies a demographic of the spectator.” Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, “executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that at least one spectator be detected, wherein the spectator is detected by a radio-frequency receiver which detects and radio-frequency identification tag of the spectator.”

Cohen teaches a method for display advertisements according to date, time, and weather (see col. 4, lines 47-53 and col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 3). Cohen does not teach “executing a triggered rule for causing the display of the content on the display device, wherein the triggered rule specifies that at least one spectator be detected” as claimed in Claim 1, and essentially as claimed in Claim 20, nor “displaying content corresponding to each satisfied rule, wherein a first satisfied rule specifies that a spectator be detected and a second satisfied rule specifies a demographic of the spectator” as claimed in Claim 14. Cohen teaches only that geography and weather affect the display of content. Cohen does not teach that the detection of a spectator satisfies a rule for the display of content. Cohen’s current status data of the vehicle does not include information about the presence of a spectator, essentially as claimed in Claim 1, much less the use of radio-frequency tags to detect the spectator, essentially as claimed in Claim 20, or the use of a demographic of a spectator, essentially as claimed in Claim 14. Therefore, Cohen fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1, 14, and 20.

Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1. Claims 15-19 depend from Claim 14. Claim 21 depends from Claim 20. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1, 14, and 21. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen. The Examiner stated essentially that Cohen teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 10 and 11.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-21, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889